

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on December 8, 2011 which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application, where claims 1, 10 and 11 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,808,792 (Woodgate) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,540 (Allen) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0063914 (Steiner). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 1-11 are patentable over Woodgate, Allen and Steiner for at least the following reasons.

Woodgate is directed to an observer tracking display in which image data, displayed by at least three image displays along respective different directions, is updated depending on the lateral position of an observer. Allen is directed to an autostereoscopic display driver for display of a 3D scene from different viewpoints. As correctly noted on page 4, paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Woodgate and Allen do not disclose or suggest minimizing any difference between viewing angles. Allen is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Woodgate and Allen.

Allen is directed to holographic diffusers where a collimated light beam is sent through a substrate matrix of a plurality of nested individual joined geometrically shaped cells. Each of the cells contains a patterned holographic diffuser or binary optic sheet which produces a transmitted diffused light beam from each of the cells, and then superimposes each transmitted diffused light beams from each of the cells to produce a combined resultant diffused light beam, where a FIG 9 shows the resultant luminance versus projection angle for two superimposed diffusion profiles when partially collimated is input to a holographic diffuser.

It is respectfully submitted that Woodgate, Allen, Steiner, and combination thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 11 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

optical means for displaying multiple viewing cones, a first cone of the multiple viewing cones comprises different views so that a different view is observed by a right eye and a left eye of a viewer of the multiview display device, the different views of the first cone having an angular distribution relative to the display device; and...

the angular distribution has a first part of adjacent views with increasing viewing angle and a second part of adjacent views with decreasing viewing angle;

a difference between a viewing angle corresponding to the first observation angle of a first view at a first boundary of the first viewing cone and a viewing angle corresponding to the second observation angle of a second view at a second boundary of the first viewing cone is minimized.

Minimizing such as difference is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Woodgate, Allen


and Steiner, alone or in combination. Rather, FIG 9 of Steiner merely shows luminance versus projection angle for superimposed diffusion profiles of two adjacent cells. Steiner is completely devoid of any relationship between viewing angles and observations angles, such as shown in FIG 6 of the present application. Woodgate, Allen, Steiner, and combination thereof do not even disclose or suggest any relationship between viewing angles and observations angles, let alone disclosing or suggesting minimizing a difference between a viewing angle corresponding to a first observation angle, of a first view at a first boundary of the first viewing cone, and a viewing angle corresponding to the second observation angle of a second view at a second boundary of the first viewing cone.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, and 10 and 11 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-9 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1 as well as their individually patentable elements. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 5, 2012

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:

Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(914) 333-9643